

PATENT APPLICATION
FD20014

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): D'Rourke et al. : Date: 30 October 2003

Application No.: 09/626,979 : Group Art Unit: 2879

Filed: 27 July 2000 : Examiner: K. Ramsey

For: FIELD EMISSION DISPLAY AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 31 2003

OFFICIAL

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING FACSIMILE
TRANSMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE ON THE DATE SHOWN BELOW.Sally Hartsen

Type Name of Person Signing Certification

Sally Hartsen
SIGNATURE10-31-03
DATEAMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.115Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,
Washington, D.C. 20231

SIR:

In response to the First Office Action dated 9 July 2003, please amend the
above identified application as follows:

Amendments to the Claims begin on page 2.

Remarks begin on page

11/03/03 10:25 AM BILLS 00000005 502117 09626979
01 10.00 DA

PATENT APPLICATION
FD20014

The present invention disposes phosphor along channels (in strips) instead of discrete pixels, with a preferred depth of the channels being 10-12 micrometers (page 3, lines 11-13) and where the entire side is not coated (page 3, lines 12) in order to provide greater shielding of the phosphor material from the electric field.

More specifically, claim 1 as amended is not obvious since the phosphor is disposed along channels (in the present invention) as opposed to being placed in pixels. Claim 1 as amended includes the step "disposing phosphor along the second channels on the uncovered portions of the substrate;".

Claims 3-5, 7-9 and 12-13 are believed allowable at least since they depend from what is believed to be an allowable claim.

Claim 14 is believed to not be anticipated by Haven since the phosphor is disposed along channels (in the present invention) as opposed to being placed in pixels as in Haven.

Claims 15 and 19-20 are believed allowable at least since they depend from what is believed to be an allowable claim.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-13, 15, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103 has been overcome by the amendment and remarks.

OBJECTION TO CLAIM 15

Claim 15 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. This claim is believed allowable since it depends from what is believed to be an allowable independent claim as amended.

Accordingly, it is believed that the objection to claim 15 has been overcome by the amendment and remarks.

The remaining cited references have been reviewed and are not believed to affect the patentability of the claims as amended.


No amendment made herein was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated; and no amendment made herein was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to deposit account #502117.

PATENT APPLICATION
FD20014

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
D'Rourke et al.



William E. Koch
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 29,659
Tel. (602) 952-3486
bill.koch@motorola.com

MOTOROLA, INC.
Corporate Law Department
Mail Drop 56-238
3102 North 56th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85018-6697